

INITED STATED DEPA

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 09/064,474 04/22/98 ROY 5 TRA-040 **EXAMINER** LMC1/0829 DAVID P GORDON WHITMORE, S 65 WOODS END ROAD **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER STAMFORD CT 06905 2783 **DATE MAILED:** 08/29/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application No.

Advisory Action

Applicant(s)

Subhash et al.

Examiner

09/064,474

Stacy Whitmore

Group Art Unit 2783



THE	PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]
á	a) expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
	expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
(Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
☐ <u>'</u>	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).
App but	plicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Aug 4, 2000</u> has been considered with the following effect, is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
X	The proposed amendment(s):
	will not be entered because:
	★ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE: Prior to the final rejection, examiner stated in the interview with applicant that the term "directly coupled" would have overcome the prior art at the time, and a new search including that limitation - "see other"
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
X	For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
_	Claims allowed: <u>none</u>
	Claims objected to: 6-10 and 16-18
	Claims rejected: <u>1-5, 11-15, 19-21, and 23-27</u>
	The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner.
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)
X	Other would have to be done. However, the term "directly coupled" was not submitted prior to the final rejection, and therfore has not search. The prior art of record still applied at the time of final rejection. Therefore, the amendments after final rejection containing supervisory Patent Examiner "directly coupled" have not been entered. Technology Center 2700